

RICE & BRONITSKY  
Paul E. Rice (State Bar No. 062509)  
350 Cambridge Avenue, Suite 225  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
Telephone: 650-289-9088  
Facsimile: 650-289-9093  
price@civlit.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
STEVEN NERAYOFF

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

STEVEN NERAYOFF,

Plaintiff,

v.

RAGER, BELL, DOSKOCIL and MEYER,  
BRAD DOSKOCIL,

Defendants.

Case No.: C-07-03101 JW

**CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT**

Date: October 15, 2007  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Cttrm: 8, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Judge: Hon. James Ware

**I. JURISDICTION AND SERVICE.**

The Court has jurisdiction of this matter, pursuant to 28 USC 1332, as the parties are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. Several attempts at service of process on both defendants have been unsuccessful, however the process server has indicated that based upon information he recently received, he will be able to complete service by October 5, 2007.

**II. FACTS.**

Defendants Rager, Bell, Dorskocil and Meyer, and Brad Dorskocil ("Defendant") provided Plaintiff with accounting, income tax planning, income tax return preparation, and audit representation services with respect to Plaintiff's Federal and State income tax obligations and returns for calendar years 1999, 2000, and 2001.

Defendants failed to exercise the proper degree of knowledge and skill common to Certified

Public Accountants, and that said failure substantially contributed to the issuance to Plaintiff, by the Internal Revenue Service, of notices of deficiencies and assessments of additional taxes, interest and penalties due in amounts not yet determined exactly, but totaling in the millions of dollars, and further, to Plaintiff being required to retain the services of other professionals to assist him in negotiating with, and contesting, the notices of deficiencies and assessments of the Internal Revenue Service. As Defendants have only recently been served with the Summons and Complaint, they have not yet had an opportunity to file a response to the Complaint.

### **III. LEGAL ISSUES.**

Did Defendants comply with their legal duties to Plaintiff.

### **IV. MOTIONS.**

There have been no motions filed in this case.

### **V. AMENDMENT OF PLEADINGS.**

Plaintiff does not anticipate amending the pleadings.

### **VI. EVIDENCE PRESERVATION.**

Plaintiff has, to the best of his knowledge, maintained all documents relating to this case.

### **VII. DISCLOSURES.**

No disclosures have been made yet.

### **VIII. DISCOVERY.**

No discovery has been taken at this time.

### **IX. RELATED CASES.**

There are no related cases.

### **X. RELIEF.**

Plaintiff seeks damages according to proof, in excess of one million dollars.

### **XI. SETTLEMENT AND ADR.**

Plaintiff is willing to participate in mediation.

### **XII. CONSENT TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR ALL PURPOSES.**

Plaintiff has declined to proceed before a magistrate judge.

### **XIII. OTHER REFERENCES.**

1 This matter is not suitable for binding arbitration, a special master, or the Judicial Panel on  
2 Multidistrict Litigation.

3 **XIV. NARROWING OF ISSUES.**

4 As Defendants have not yet appeared in this case, issues cannot be narrowed at this time.

5 **XV. EXPEDITED SCHEDULE.**

6 This case can be handled on an expedited basis with streamlined procedures.

7 **XVI. SCHEDULING.**

8 As Defendants have not yet appeared in this case, Plaintiff requests that any scheduling  
9 decisions be made at a later Case Management Conference, after Defendants have appeared.

10 **XVII. TRIAL.**

11 Plaintiff has requested a jury trial and anticipates the trial will last seven days.

12 **XVIII. DISCLOSURE OF NON-PARTY INTERESTED ENTITIES OR PERSONS.**

13 Plaintiff has not filed a Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons, as Plaintiff  
14 does not believe there are any.

15  
16 Dated: October 1, 2007

17  
18 **RICE & BRONITSKY**

19  
20 By: /s/ Paul E. Rice  
21 Paul E. Rice  
22 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
23 Steven Nerayoff  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28